

**INDEX TO
EVIDENTIARY HEARING TRANSCRIPTS
ATTORNEY CATHERINE ADAMS
SEPTEMBER 25, 2007
CROSS EXAMINATION: PAGES 262-285**

EFFECTIVELY ARGUED THE EIKENELLA ISSUE TO THE JURY

DURING GUILT-PHASE CLOSING ARGUMENT

- TOLD THE JURY TWO POSSIBILITIES ON HOW JONES GOT
THE EIKENELLA INFECTION: 1. FOOD PARTICLES, OR
2. CUTTING HIS HAND.....269, LINES 19-25
270, LINES 1-5
- POINTED OUT IT IS NOT KNOWN WHETHER THE VICTIM,
RHODA NATHAN, HAD EIKENELLA BECAUSE SHE WAS
NEVER TESTED FOR IT.....270, LINES 5-16
- REFUTED DR. MCDONOUGH’S “FIGHT BITE” THEORY
ON HOW JONES GOT THE EIKENELLA INFECTION.....270, LINES 16-25
271, LINES 1-5
- HIGHLIGHTED FOR THE JURY DR. SOLOMKIN’S
IMPRESSIVE CREDENTIALS IN THE AREA OF
INFECTIOUS DISEASES.....271, LINES 6-16

PRIOR TO TRIAL, KNEW THE PENDANT LOOKED LIKE THE ONE

PICTURED IN PHOTOGRAPHS OBTAINED BY THE PROSECUTION

- AGREES PRIOR TO TRIAL SHE VIEWED THE PENDANT
(STATE’S EXHIBIT 3).....272, LINES 13-17
- AGREES PRIOR TO TRIAL SHE WAS TOLD BY THE PROSECUTION
THE VICTIM’S SON IDENTIFIED THE PENDANT (STATE’S EXHIBIT 3)
AS A ONE-OF-A-KIND PIECE OF JEWELRY MADE FOR HIS MOTHER
FROM A FAMILY HEIRLOOM.....274, LINES 14-18

- AGREES PRIOR TO TRIAL SHE WAS ALLOWED TO VIEW
THE STATE'S EVIDENCE.....273, LINE 25
274, LINES 1-5
- AGREES THE PENDANT (STATE'S EXHIBIT 3) LOOKS LIKE
THE PENDANT THE VICTIM, RHODA NATHAN, IS
WEARING IN THE PHOTO (STATE'S EXHIBIT 1).....275, LINES 1-4
- AGREES PRIOR TO TRIAL SHE KNEW THE PROSECUTION
REPRESENTED THE BLUE ASH POLICE FOUND A
PENDANT IN JONES'S TOOLBOX.....276, LINES 8-12
- AGREES THE PHOTO OF THE PENDANT IN JONES'S
TOOLBOX (STATE'S EXHIBIT 36) LOOKS LIKE
THE PENDANT THE VICTIM, RHODA NATHAN, IS
WEARING IN THE PHOTO (STATE'S EXHIBIT 1).....276, LINES 13-20
- AGREES THE JURY WAS ABLE TO SEE BOTH THE
PENDANT (STATE'S EXHIBIT 3) AND THE PHOTO
OF THE VICTIM, RHODA NATHAN, WEARING A
PENDANT (STATE'S EXHIBIT 1).....276, LINES 5-7

DISINGENUOUS ABOUT CALLING THE VICTIM'S SON, VALENTINE NATHAN, AT TRIAL

- AGREES PRIOR TO CALLING THE VICTIM'S SON, VALENTINE NATHAN,
AT TRIAL, SHE WOULD HAVE TRIED TO INTERVIEW HIM ABOUT HIS
INCONSISTENT DESCRIPTION OF THE PENDANT IN SERGEANT
SCHAFFER'S REPORT.....283, LINES 10-13
- AGREES SHE WOULD HAVE TAKEN A PHOTOGRAPH OF
THE PENDANT WITH HER TO THE INTERVIEW.....282, LINES 12-17

- CLAIMS SHE WOULD HAVE CALLED VALENTINE NATHAN AT TRIAL
EVEN IF HE WAS ABLE TO EXPLAIN IN A SATISFACTORY MANNER
HIS PREVIOUS INCONSISTENT DESCRIPTION OF THE PENDANT.....282, LINES 14-17
- CLAIMS SHE WOULD HAVE CALLED VALENTINE NATHAN AT TRIAL
EVEN THOUGH HE WOULD BE SUBJECT TO CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY THE STATE ON THE PENDANT.....284, LINES 16-25
285, LINES 1-3